

Dear Colleagues

Please accept our apologies for the failed video and intermittent phone connection. The 9th Circle was standing room only. In recompense here are our accounts of the meeting.

The Director arrived about 9:45 from a previous meeting at SiDet and stayed for an hour. John Womersley moderated. The Director began with an explanation of his decision. It followed the written document (on the internal DZero www page) fairly closely. He mentioned a number of things including the financial straits of the laboratory, the prioritization of the projects, and strength of the existing program notwithstanding the cancellations. Following his opening statements, six questions or statements were taken from the audience. These are listed below, together with brief summaries of the responses taken from Jerry's notes.

Jerry Blazey stated that the case for the DZero silicon upgrade cancellation was weak, that the only explicit mention was lost luminosity by CDF. And that the document did not mention improved performance and the resulting enhanced commitment. The document also lacked discussion of possible mitigating strategies for the most deleterious aspects of the upgrade. He asked if management had considered mitigation in the decision, why hadn't DZero been approached, and will management consider it in the future.

JB Account: The Director answered that they were concerned about this but felt they could not discuss mitigating responses until the decision had been made. He indicated a willingness to consider proposals subject to reasonable schedule and budget constraints.

Paul Slattery noted that the document had said that the DZero documentation had not been fully studied and inquired into the rationale for the omission.

JB Account: The Director responded that even had our shutdown schedule been determined to be realistic it would not have changed the decision.

Greg Snow asked if the Board of Overseers and the special Advisory Committee had been consulted.

JB Account: The Director said yes but that no committee gave unambiguous advice.

Greg also asked why the budget considerations were stressed when three weeks previously this had not been discussed with the Board of Overseers (of which Greg is a member.)

JB Account: The Director responded that he had been discussing it where appropriate but that the amount of detail depended on the committee.

Drew Alton asked what was next on the priority list or would be terminated should funding shortfalls continue.

JB Account: The Director replied that the next highest priority item was the accelerator luminosity upgrades

Chip Brock asked the Director to “go on the road” and sell the remainder of the program at funding agencies, universities, and laboratories in person and by giving colloquia.

JB Account: The Director agreed this should be done.

Petros Rapidis gave a four or five slide presentation expressing his opinion that the decision process was not transparent and flawed, that the Director had not managed or advocated the program, and that the Director had failed the laboratory and him personally. Petros’ presentation generated sustained applause from the audience.

JB Account: The Director responded that he has spent the last four years focusing on major problems, initially the lack of funds for the upgrades, then the troubles with NUMI/MINOS and lately the accelerator. He said he has been a steadfast advocate of the lab and Run II.

Once again, our apologies for the incompleteness of this summary and any inaccuracies herein. Others who were present should feel free to add their impressions. Thanks again for your patience during the meeting.

Best regards
Jerry and John